



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/771,890

02/04/2004

Hobie Reber

HOB-P-04-001

3879

29013 7590 03/23/2007
PATENTS+TMS, P.C.
2849 W. ARMITAGE AVE.
CHICAGO, IL 60647

EXAMINER

ALLEN, WILLIAM J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3625

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

03/23/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/771,890	REBER, HOBIE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William J. Allen	3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Prosecution History Summary

Claims 1-20 are pending and rejected as set forth below.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection.

In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "wherein the multi-dealer retails establishment is a structure...of the plurality of merchants" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Additionally, in response to applicant's argument regarding nonanalogous art and failure to show proper suggestion to combine references, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Furthermore, The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

Art Unit: 3625

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the cited references clearly constitute analogous art and provide adequate motivation to use in combination with the base references.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-3, 8-11, 13, 15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. (US 20030110078) in view of Russell (US 20020083061).**

Regarding claim 1, Chang teaches a system for locating and determining an availability and location of an item offered for sale in a shopping mall comprising:

providing a computer network (see at least: Fig. 1);

a database associated with the network (see at least: 0008 lines 2-6, 0010 lines 4-7, 0023 lines 20-26, Fig. 1);

wherein the merchant information is associated with the location of each one of the plurality of merchants wherein the merchants are located only within the interior space of the multi dealer retail establishment (see at least: 0008 lines 2-6, 0010 lines 4-7, 0023 lines 20-26);

wherein the item information is associated with a description of the item and a price of the item wherein each one of the plurality of items is only locatable within the interior space of the multi dealer retail establishment (see at least: abstract lines 10-14, 0008 lines 2-6, 0010 lines 4-7, 0023 lines 20-26);

a computer terminal located in the multi-dealer retail establishment (see at least: abstract lines 10-14, Fig. 1(#14), 0025 lines 5-10) and

wherein the computer terminal connects the computer to the computer network
(see at least: Fig. 1(#14), 0020, 0025 lines 5-10) *and*
enables access to item information and merchant information (see at least:
abstract lines 10-14, Fig. 1(#14), 0023 lines 24-26, 0025 lines 5-10) *and further wherein*
the computer terminal is remote with respect to the database (see at least: Fig.
1(#14), 0020, 0025 lines 5-10) *and*
determines the location of the item in the multi-dealer retail establishment by
searching the item information in the database wherein the item information is associated
with the location of the merchant in the multi-dealer retail establishment (see at least:
abstract lines 10-14, 0010 lines 4-7, 0019 lines 13-16, 0023 lines 24-26, 0025 lines 5-10,
claim 26)

Chang teaches all of the above including providing a database with such information as stock of the product, price, availability, and the physical location of the product in a particular store (i.e. *merchant*) in a shopping center, mall, or similar venue (see at least: abstract lines 10-14, 0023 lines 24-26, 0025 lines 1-3 and 6-10). Though not explicitly stated, the step of and means for inputting the merchant information and the product information is implicitly implied by Chang as some means and step of inputting such information must be performed in order for database 31 to contain such information. Chang merely lacks an explicit teaching of a *means for inputting merchant information* and a *means for inputting item information*.

Art Unit: 3625

In the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches a method for providing a searchable electronic database for use in tradeshows (see at least: abstract lines 1-2). As noted by Russell, a typical problem with such events is the difficulty for an attendee to find a particular vendor when in a large venue (see at least 0003 lines 10-12). To remedy such deficiencies, Russell provides a dedicated computer system or kiosk in the venue operable with searchable reader software to provide a user with the ability to search and have presented information regarding vendors at the trade show such as vendor products, catalogue information, vendor location, etc. (see at least: 00108-10, 0007 lines 14-17, 0009 lines 5-8 and 22-26, 0011 all). More specifically, Russell teaches a vendor uploading via a secure web page information such as the vendor's name, web site, products offered, location, etc. (see at least: 0007 all, 0009 all). By explicitly teaching the inputting of the vendor's products (i.e. *a product list*), Russell teaches the implicitly implied *means for inputting merchant information and item information*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Chang to have included *means for inputting merchant information and item information* as taught by Russell in order to provide a system that allows vendors to upload information into an electronic database compatible with searchable reader software thereby facilitating efficient search for and generation of desired information (such as product or vendor location) for a user in a multi dealer establishment (see at least: Russell, abstract, 0006, 0008).

Art Unit: 3625

Regarding claim 2, Chang in view Russell teaches *wherein the computer network is the internet* (see at least: Chang, 0023).

Regarding claim 3, Chang teaches all of the above and further teaches maintaining a database, remote from the kiosk, for use by a customer (see at least: Fig. 1). Chang, however, does not explicitly teach a *remote server* for maintaining the database and a *website for access to the database*. Russell teaches *remote server* for maintaining the database and a *website for access to the database* (see at least: abstract lines 5-9 (note: the database may be “accessed on a wireless network”), 0007 lines 7-11 and 14-17, 0009 lines 4-8, 0012 lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Chang to have included a *website for access to the database* as taught by Russell in order to allow vendors to upload information into an electronic database compatible with searchable reader software thereby facilitating efficient search for and generation of desired information for a user in a multi dealer establishment (see at least: Russell, abstract, 0006, 0008).

Regarding claim 8, Chang teaches a method for locating and determining an availability and location of an item offered for sale in a shopping mall comprising:

providing a computer network (see at least: Fig. 1);

providing a database connected to the computer network wherein the database stores merchant information associated with the merchant and further wherein the merchant information has the location of the merchant within the multi-dealer retail establishment (see at least: 0008 lines 2-8, 0010 lines 4-7, 0023 lines 20-26, Fig. 1); Note: "location of a product in a particular store";

wherein the product list has item information associated with items offered for sale by the merchant wherein the items in the product list are determined only from the items available from the plurality of merchants within the interior space of the multi-dealer retail establishment (see at least: abstract lines 10-14, 0008 lines 2-6, 0010 lines 4-7, 0023 lines 20-26);

providing a terminal in the multi-dealer retail establishment wherein the terminal access the database for displaying the merchant information of the merchant in the database via a computer network wherein the terminal is only accessible at the multi-dealer retail establishment (see at least: abstract lines 10-14, Fig. 1(#14), 0025 lines 5-10);

searching the product list in the merchant information based on item information associated with the item (see at least: 0007 lines 5-8, 0011 lines 9-13, 0019 lines 12-16, 0023 lines 4-19, 0023-0025 all);

determining the location of the merchant in the multi-dealer retail establishment based on the merchant information wherein the terminal displays the location of the item in the multi-retail establishment based on the location of the merchant wherein the merchant is only located

Art Unit: 3625

within the interior space of the multi-dealer retail-establishment (see at least: abstract lines 12-14, 0010 lines 4-7, 0023 lines 24-26, 0025 lines 6-10, claim 26).

Chang teaches all of the above including providing a database with such information as stock of the product, price, and the physical location of the product in a particular store(i.e. *merchant*) in a shopping center, mall, or similar venue (see at least: abstract lines 10-14, 0023 lines 24-26, 0025 lines 1-3 and 6-10). Though not explicitly stated, there is the step of inputting the product information that is implicitly implied by Chang but which must be performed in order for database 31 to contain such information. Though such feature is seemingly inherent, Chang lacks an explicit teaching of *inputting a product list of the merchant into the merchant information in the database*.

In the same field of endeavor, Russell teaches a method for providing a searchable electronic database for use in tradeshow (see at least: abstract lines 1-2). As noted by Russell, a typical problem with such events is the difficulty for an attendee to find a particular vendor when in a large venue (see at least 0003 lines 10-12). To remedy such deficiencies, Russell provides a dedicated computer system or kiosk in the venue operable with searchable reader software to provide a user with the ability to search and have presented information regarding vendors at the trade show such as vendor products, catalogue information, vendor location, etc. (see at least: 00108-10, 0007 lines 14-17, 0009 lines 5-8 and 22-26, 0011 all). More specifically, Russell teaches a vendor uploading via a secure web page information such as the vendor's name, web site, products offered, etc. (see at least: 0007, 0009). By explicitly teaching the inputting of the

Art Unit: 3625

vendor's products (i.e. *a product list*), Russell teaches the implicitly implied step of *inputting a product list of the merchant into the merchant information in the database*.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Chang to have included *inputting a product list of the merchant into the merchant information in the database* as taught by Russell in order to provide a system that allows vendors to upload information into an electronic database compatible with searchable reader software thereby facilitating efficient search for and generation of desired information (such as product or vendor location) for a user in a multi dealer establishment (see at least: Russell, abstract, 0006, 0008).

Regarding claims 9-11, these claims closely parallel claims 2-3 and are thereby rejected for at least the same rationale.

Regarding claim 13, Chang in view of Russell teaches *wherein the first access is from a remote computer terminal with respect to the database* (see at least: Chang, Fig. 1; Russell, abstract lines 5-9, 0007 lines 7-11 and 14-17, 0009 lines 4-8, 0012 lines 1-10).

Regarding claim 15, Chang in view of Russell teaches *a computer website providing access to the database wherein the computer website is remote with respect to the database* (see at least: Russell, abstract, 0007, 0009, 0012). The Examiner notes that the user may access the database/web page through a wireless network using a computer system supplied at the tradeshow (see at least: abstract, 0012).

Regarding claim 18, Chang in view of Russell teaches *wherein the item information includes geographical information associated with the item for sale by the merchant* (see at least: Chang, abstract lines 10-14, 0023 lines 24-26, 0025 lines 1-3 and 6-10). The Examiner notes that the location of a product “in a particular store” constitutes geographic information.

3. **Claims 4-5, 7, 12, 14, 17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Russell as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Pugliese III et al. (US 20010044751).**

Regarding claim 4, Chang in view of Russell teach all of the above as noted and further teach a means for inputting merchant information (see at least: Chang, abstract, 0023, Fig. 1; Russell, abstract, 0002, 0007, 0009, 0014, claim 1 and 7). It). Chang in view of Russell, however, does not expressly teach *a means for modifying the merchant information*. In the same field of endeavor, Pugliese teaches a mall kiosk available to shoppers (see at least: abstract). Pugliese further teaches a merchant or “merchant administrator” with the ability to logon and update (i.e. modify) the merchant information in the database, and thereby teaches *means for modifying the merchant information* (see at least: abstract, 0275, 0277, 0334-0336, 0340-0341, Fig. 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Chang in view of Russell to have provided *a means for modifying the merchant information* as taught by Pugliese in order to provide a merchant management function that allows a merchant administrator to logon and easily update the merchant information for a specific merchant location (see at least: Pugliese, 0275, 0336).

Regarding claim 5 and 14, Chang in view of Russell teaches all of the above as noted and further teaches a secure web page available for vendors (i.e. merchants) to upload information to a database (see at least: Russell, abstract, 0007, 0009). Chang in view of Russell, however, does not expressly teach wherein *a password associated with the merchant for accessing the merchant information in the database*. Pugliese teaches a registered merchant or merchant administrator logging into the ShopLive system and updating merchant information (see at least: abstract, 0275, 0277, 0334-0336, 0340-0341, Fig. 21). Pugliese further teaches wherein the merchant may receive their password via email when using the lost password request function (see at least: 0332, Fig. 20 #100 and #106). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Chang in view of Russell to have included *a password associated with the merchant for accessing the merchant information in the database* as taught by Pugliese in order to provide a merchant management function that allows a merchant administrator to logon and easily update the merchant information for a specific merchant location (see at least: Pugliese, 0275, 0336).

Regarding claim 7, Chang in view of Russell teaches all of the above and further teaches uploading item information, without limitation, such as product type, model number, price, etc. (see at least: Chang, 0019). Chang in view of Russell, however, does not expressly teach *a means for inputting an image associated with the item in the item information in database and a means for accessing the image associated with the item in the database from the computer terminal*. Pugliese teaches *a means for inputting an image associated with the item in the item information in database and a means for accessing the image associated with the item in the database from*

Art Unit: 3625

the computer terminal (see at least: 0271-0272, 0279, 0368, Fig. 15, claim 14). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Chang in view of Russell to have included *a means for inputting an image associated with the item in the item information in database and a means for accessing the image associated with the item in the database from the computer terminal* as taught by Pugliese in order to provide a system that supports content (such as images), thereby displaying to the shopper different views in order to allow them to better assess a product for purchase (see at least: Pugliese, 0010, 0125).

Regarding claim 12, Chang in view of Russell teach all of the above as noted and further teach a means for inputting merchant information (see at least: Chang, abstract, 0023, Fig. 1; Russell, abstract, 0002, 0007, 0009, 0014, claim 1 and 7). It). Chang in view of Russell, however, does not expressly teach *providing a second access to the database for modifying the merchant information via the computer network*. Pugliese teaches a merchant or “merchant administrator” with the ability to logon and update (i.e. modify) the merchant information in the database, and thereby teaches *providing a second access to the database for modifying the merchant information via the computer network* (see at least: abstract, 0275, 0277, 0334-0336, 0340-0341, Fig. 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Chang in view of Russell to have provided *providing a second access to the database for modifying the merchant information via the computer network* as taught by Pugliese in order to provide a merchant management function that allows a

Art Unit: 3625

merchant administrator to logon and easily update the merchant information for a specific merchant location (see at least: Pugliese, 0275, 0336).

Regarding claim 17, Chang in view of Russell teaches all of the above and further teaches uploading item information, without limitation, such as product type, model number, price, etc. (see at least: Chang, 0019). Chang in view of Russell, however, does not expressly teach *downloading an image into the item information of the item in the database via the computer network wherein the image is associated with the item*. Pugliese teaches *downloading an image into the item information of the item in the database via the computer network wherein the image is associated with the item* (see at least: 0271-0272, 0279, 0368, Fig. 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Chang in view of Russell to have included *downloading an image into the item information of the item in the database via the computer network wherein the image is associated with the item* as taught by Pugliese in order to provide a system that supports content (such as images), thereby displaying to the shopper different views in order to allow them to better assess a product for purchase (see at least: Pugliese, 0010, 0125).

Regarding claim 19, Chang in view of Russell teaches all of the above and further teaches a user inputting information and performing a search based on the information (see at least: Chang, 0007, 0011, 0023; Russell, abstract, 0008). Chang in view of Russell, however, does not expressly show *inputting user information into the database via the computer system wherein the information is associated with the user and searching the product list in the*

Art Unit: 3625

merchant information based on the user information. Pugliese teaches inputting user information into the database via the computer system wherein the information is associated with the user and searching the product list in the merchant information based on the user information (see at least: 0013, 0117, 0143, 0177-0179, 0206). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Chang in view of Russell to have included inputting user information into the database via the computer system wherein the information is associated with the user and searching the product list in the merchant information based on the user information as taught by Pugliese in order to provide a system that allows access to shopper profile information interactively during a shopping session to determine shopper preferences and allow merchants to serve the shopper better (see at least: Pugliese, 0117).

Regarding claim 20, Chang in view of Russell teaches all of the above and further teaches accessing product availability information and product stock information (see at least: Chang, abstract lines 10-14, 0023 lines 24-26, 0025 lines 1-3 and 6-10). Chang in view of Russell, however, does not expressly show *inputting inventory of the merchant into the database via the computer system wherein the inventory is associated with the product list of the merchant and further wherein the inventory includes the item for sale and modifying the inventory of the merchant via the computer system. Pugliese teaches inputting inventory of the merchant into the database via the computer system wherein the inventory is associated with the product list of the merchant and further wherein the inventory includes the item for sale and modifying the inventory of the merchant via the computer system (see at least: 0099, 0126, 0140). It would have*

Art Unit: 3625

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have modified the invention of Chang in view of Russell to have included *inputting inventory of the merchant into the database via the computer system wherein the inventory is associated with the product list of the merchant and further wherein the inventory includes the item for sale and modifying the inventory of the merchant via the computer system* as taught by Pugliese in order to provide a system that supports shoppers by checking availability of items for sale at a store location and helps the shopper complete the purchase as in a normal transaction (see at least: Pugliese, abstract).

4. Claims 6 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Russell as applied to claims 1 and 8, and in further view of 892u.

Regarding claim 6 and 16, Chang in view of Russell teaches locating an item in a multi retailer establishment (see at least: Chang, abstract; Russell, abstract). Russell further teaches how providing a map can be advantageous for shoppers to locate vendors and items (see at least: 0004). Chang in view of Russell, however, does not expressly teach *an electronic map associated with the multi dealer retail establishment wherein the location of the merchant associated with the item information is displayed on the electronic map*. 892u teaches a mall kiosk equipped with a touch screen monitor. 892u further teaches a window on the monitor of the mall kiosk that provides a sales assistant for providing the location of a desired product and an animated (i.e. electronic map) on the touch screen showing current location and how to get to the store containing desired product (see at least: Paragraph 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the invention of Chang in view of Russell to have included *displaying an electronic map wherein the location of the merchant associated with the item information is displayed on the electronic map* as taught by 892u in order to provide an easy, interactive means for displaying an animated map directing a shopper to a particular store, thereby assisting the shopper in locating the product quickly (see at least: 892u, Page 1).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William J. Allen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1443. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff A. Smith can be reached on (571) 272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

William J. Allen
Patent Examiner
March 19, 2007


MATTHEW S. GART
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600